Language Policy: a View from the Periphery of Europe

Scandinavian Language Policy, its problems and possible Perspectives for the Rest of Europe: Is there a regional Alternative to English?

Gregersen, Frans

Published in:
Angles on the English-Speaking World

Publication date:
2009

Document version
Peer reviewed version

Frans Gregersen

Scandinavian language policy, its problems and possible perspectives for the rest of Europe: Is there a regional alternative to English?

Frans Gregersen is professor of Danish language at the University of Copenhagen and director of the Danish National Research Foundation Centre for Language Change in Real Time (LANCHART) – a centre of excellence established in 2005. The team of researchers at the centre study the development of the Danish speech community based on the replication of a number of previous sociolinguistic and dialectological studies of spoken Danish and an analysis of the historical processes which may have conditioned the development. He has also served on the Nordic Language Council.

Abstract:

Based on an analysis of the Nordic experience of creating a regional alternative to English, the author sketches a model of a linguistic map of Europe. It contains five separate regions based on linguistic family relationships and hence offers a discount with respect to opportunities of mutual comprehension competence. The cultural and historical conditions for the development of such a regional area of mutual linguistic understanding are discussed with reference to the Nordic experience. The guiding principle proposed is "speak your own language and understand your neighbour's". The Nordic experience on which the model is based simultaneously illustrates the problematic relation between ideals and practical implementation in the area of language policy: the vision of a Nordic language community has been hammered out at a time when it was in effect being undermined. The article therefore hovers somewhere between the utopia and the obituary.

Introduction

In John E. Joseph's impressive *Language and Politics* (2006) it is stated that 'Language is through and through political'. Following this logic everything linguistic has a political side to it and the term 'Language policy' becomes awkward. Language policy is thus at least a concept which has to be further defined in order to make sense.

First of all we distinguish the situations where the use and/or status of a language is regulated by law from the situations where laws and regulations which do not focus on language use have (presumably unintended) linguistic consequences. It is, e.g., stated by law that in Finland the two languages Swedish and Finnish may be used interchangeably for state purposes; they are both recognized as official languages of Finland. Another example is that it has been proposed first in Sweden and then in Denmark that the respective parliaments adopt a 'language law' stating that Swedish and Danish respectively is the main language of the realm (on the Swedish language debate see the various papers in Milani 2007). The discussion of language policy tends to focus on such explicit issues as a policy for which language to use when and where.

On the other hand, there is no denying that if, e.g., the World Trade Organization treats educational institutions as just another goods or services industry, it has profound consequences, not least linguistically, although this has not been the main issue (or

an issue at all) for the WTO. Furthermore, it has rarely been foregrounded that the same is true for the heavy import of American TV productions and films in Europe, although the linguistic consequences are somewhat mitigated by the widespread use of dubbing. Only occasionally, for instance when France once wanted to regulate the output on the state channels, do the cultural effects abroad of the American cultural industry surface - only to disappear again as soon as it is realized that a substantial part of the United States export value stems from the films and television series which have become second nature for Europeans and indeed a common denominator for the Western hemisphere as a whole. Anyway, the whole discussion is now a non-issue due to the overwhelming heavenly presence of satellites.

The Danish discussion of language policy

The Danish discussion of language policy traditionally features three related themes:

- The English influence, especially the possible loss of whole domains (Davidsen-Nielsen et al. 1999) and the English influence on the Danish lexicon: loanwords, calques etc. (Sørensen 1997)[1]
- The decline of the Nordic linguistic community
- The discussion of language rights

The first and last of these issues may be seen as amenable to regulation by law, i.e. a language law would have to regulate the use of English for the purpose of (in particular higher) education in Denmark as well as the rights of immigrants from the Nordic and other countries to use their own language and have the help of an interpreter in dealing with the administrative apparatus in Denmark. Obviously, however, there are relevant statutes and regulations in the European Union to be taken into consideration here, not least because the principle of free mobility throughout the European Union of workers and goods takes precedence over national regulations. Thus it would technically, and also in practice, be a violation of this principle if it was stated by law that only Danish speaking citizens could have access to specific jobs.

In the following, I shall try to connect the three issues by looking first at the process of developing a Nordic policy for language issues. The result was a declaration on Nordic Language Policy which was accepted and signed by the Nordic ministers in 2006. The declaration is available on the net, cf. the references. Next I shall attempt to broaden the perspective to look at a possible European regional policy to counteract the hegemony of English.

Writing a declaration of language policy for the Nordic states

Introduction on the Nordic cooperative effort

The exercise was started by the secretariat for the Nordic Council of ministers. The secretariat felt that the Council needed a more visionary goal for its language policy coordinating function and got an OK from the ministers. The Nordic Council of ministers is the tip of an immense iceberg of coordinating bodies. There are five Nordic states but in all matters of language these five states multiply since there are two official languages in Finland: Swedish (the minority language) and Finnish (the majority language), and since the Sami speaking

communities are found in three of the Nordic states. Furthermore, the Åland Isles, the Faroe Islands and Greenland all have representatives in the coordinating language policy body, The Nordic Language Council. The Nordic Language Council thus features two representatives of the five member states and three members from the autonomous areas. The Nordic Language Council is an expert committee with a majority of linguists but some of the members are civil servants from the relevant ministries.

The political superstructure of the Nordic Council of Ministers evidently consists of the relevant ministers but since the language issues are relevant to ministries of culture as well as ministries of education and research, it is not so easy to single out which minister is the relevant person for language policy issues. In Denmark, for instance, the Danish Language Council is the official body for the pursuit of practical language policy in that it is in charge of the orthographical dictionary and is part of the Ministry of Culture, while all legislation which pertains to education obviously is the province of the Ministry of Education. And then again: If we are talking about higher education, i.e. the universities, these are under the auspices of the Ministry of Research and Innovation. Consequently, when Denmark had the duty of chairing the Nordic cooperation bodies in 2005, they had to establish a coordination unit for language policy involving all three ministries. Since Jørn Lund and I were at that time joint heads of this expert committee as the representatives of Denmark in the Nordic Language Council, we participated in these meetings and thus had a good impression of how complicated the whole enterprise was.

It has to be understood that the Council of Ministers itself does not deal with issues which have not previously been prepared by the civil servants from the various ministries and for this purpose there are a number of executive committees including the top civil servants from the ministries in the member states. In this case there was both a committee on education, headed by the highest ranking official of the ministry of education in close cooperation with his equal in the ministry of research and innovation, and a committee on culture with the same distinguished manpower. These committees have the job of preparing everything for the ministers so that the transactions at the highest level are efficient and actually lead to joint action. This means that the committees see to it that their minister(s) are politically safe with the proposals which are prepared by the expert committees, in this case the Nordic Language Council. The upshot of this process will be clearer below.

Background: The Delsing report on mutual intelligibility in the Nordic region

The initiative to the declaration was taken by the secretariat. They felt that it was important for the traditional cooperative effort within the field of language to give it a fresh start and they were concerned that the framework should be a broader vision of challenges and tasks to be solved in order to meet these challenges. In the Nordic Language Council we accepted the idea of a broader framework since no one could deny a certain discomfort with the situation. Ministers and members of parliaments in the Nordic countries kept talking as if the Nordic idea was till alive and kicking, whereas we in the administrative inter-Nordic bodies knew from our dealings with applications and reports that this clearly was not the case. Only a fraction of the school teachers were actually concerned with teaching the neighbouring languages and although a small minority of the mother tongue teachers were working miracles, the reality was that the Nordic countries were drifting apart linguistically.

During the work with the proposal for a declaration Lars Olof Delsing and his group finished the large scale survey of inter-Nordic comprehension (Delsing and Lundin

Åkesson 2005). Depending on one's expectations the results were a disappointment or an affirmation that things were worse than expected for the Nordic communicative community: Young persons in Scandinavia are not good at understanding each other. The relevant issue here is pragmatic. If you are not at ease with the neighbouring languages, either productively or with respect to comprehension, there is an alternative. And that is to speak English.

In order to test the feasibility of this solution we would ask whether it was easier for youngsters from Denmark, Sweden and Norway to understand spoken Danish, Norwegian or Swedish than to understand spoken English. The Delsing report investigates this question in a comparison of the understanding of authentic clips from the same TV program, i.e. *Who wants to become a millionaire?* This program is actually TV broadcasted in all the Nordic countries and England and hence was ideal as test material. The results are given in table 4.30 (Delsing and Lundin Åkesson 2005: 94) which compares the ease with which young Nordic citizens understand spoken neighbouring languages and English spoken by native speakers. The conclusion is striking: In all cases the young Scandinavians would understand each other a lot better if they spoke English – provided they would be able to speak English as a native! I shall come back to this proviso later.

The Delsing investigation had been initiated by the Nordic Foundation for Culture with the explicit intention of measuring whether mutual comprehension had improved since the 1976 study by Øivind Maurud or – as it was feared - deteriorated. Here again, the conclusion is clear. After a thorough discussion of the points of contact between the two studies (op.cit.: 120ff), Delsing and Lundin Åkesson present table 6.5, op cit.: 129. If the results from the Maurud study are set at 100 as the baseline, the results of the new study, 30 years later, show that the mutual comprehension in the Nordic countries had deteriorated by a fourth or a fifth. Since the Maurud study already indicated significant problems for Swedes in understanding Danish, a lower level of understanding thirty years later is really bad news.

A further refinement of the time perspective is a study of the level of comprehension comparing some of the youngsters with their parents (op.cit.: table 6.3:119).This points to the same conclusion: In all respects and in all cases, parents have better test results than their children. The level of inter-nordic comprehension has indeed fallen.

The inescapable conclusion from the several investigations of inter-Nordic comprehension is that Danish is the key problem. If Danes could only be effectively taught to speak a reasonable Swedish, the Finns would do much better, and the Swedes and the Norwegians would have no problem. The other conclusion is the one hinted at above: It may be too late for the effort. The good, in some cases excellent, understanding of English may have made the effort impracticable, obsolete or even a mission impossible.

The challenge of integrating the Baltic states in the Nordic cooperative effort

Thus it was with a sense of being at the brink of disaster we continued our work on a declaration which would be the framework for a renewed and hopefully grand scale effort at creating a common area of mutual comprehension in the Nordic countries. At the outset we even had another severe challenge to face up to: The current Nordic interest in the Baltic States raised the fundamental question. Why only the five Nordic states? Why not also the Baltic States? In the past, Nordic cooperation had been based on the five member states as free democratic states with a certain mutual interest in exploiting a strong state apparatus for creating widespread welfare for their citizens, but since the Iron Curtain was abandoned why not integrate the free and democratic European Union members states of the Baltic?

Why not indeed? The Nordic ministers discussed the issue precisely at the time when we were working with the declaration and from 2008 the Nordic mobility program, the so-called Nordplus family was opened to applicants from the Baltic states as a sure sign that they were accepted as *bona fide* candidate members in the Nordic cooperation organization as a whole. The only exception was that the language program was to remain focused on the Nordic states and hence is still only advertised in the Nordic languages. The rest of the Nordplus programs are now advertised in English (cf. http://www.nordplusonline.org/eng/framework_programme/about_nordplus).

From a linguistic perspective this is a major step since the Baltic States cannot now boast, nor can be expected in the immediate future to develop, public comprehension competence in any Scandinavian language. In a certain sense we had to fight on two fronts at the same time: The internal struggle for creating a common Nordic linguistic area was threatened by the English cultural hegemony and this was only underlined by the Nordic ministers agreeing on taking on board the Baltic States. This move could only strengthen the position of English to the point where English would soon become the working language of the Nordic-Baltic cooperative efforts as indeed it already is at the secretariat of Nordforsk, the Nordic research cooperation unit.

It has to borne in mind that the Nordic community is only partially based on linguistic similarities. The political and historical fates of the Nordic states have seen to it that from a linguistic point of view there is both a center and a periphery in the Nordic cooperation effort. If we stress mutual comprehension there is no doubt that the three Scandinavian languages Danish, Norwegian and Swedish are much closer to each other than the rest of the languages in the Nordic countries, although Icelandic and Faroese belong to the same linguistic group of Northern Germanic languages as well. The Sami and Finnish as well as the Greenlandic languages are utterly incomprehensible if not taught to and learnt by a Scandinavian speaking person. Thus the Nordic cooperative effort, if it is to be carried out in a Nordic language, presupposes that

- the Finns both have be able to speak Swedish and understand Danish and Norwegian
- the Icelanders have to be able to speak Danish and understand Swedish and Norwegian
- the Inuit (natives of Greenland) have be able to speak Danish and understand Swedish and Norwegian
- the Sami speaking citizens of Norway, Sweden and Finland have to be able to speak the various languages of the state they belong to and understand that of the two others
- the citizens of any Nordic state who do not have the majority language as their first language have to be able to understand the neighbouring languages

As we shall see, all these challenges had to be faced during the work on the Language Policy Declaration.

Creating a terminology

First, however, we had to create a terminology. The Swedish parliamentary report on *Mål i mun* 2002 has become the fundamental text in this respect. The Nordic declaration is no exception, but for the purpose of covering all five states and all three autonomous areas we had to go further along the same road. Thus it is stated in the preamble to the text:

- a language is *complete* if it can be used in all areas of society

- a language is *essential to society* (the original Swedish term is *samhällsbärande*) if it used in a language community for official purposes, for example education and legislation
- there are six languages which are both complete and essential to society, i.e. Danish, Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian (in both forms, i.e. both *bokmål* and *nynorsk*[2]), Icelandic and Faroese
- there are two other languages in the Nordic area which are essential to society but not complete, i.e. Sami and Greenlandic
- languages which are essential to the state are only Icelandic, Norwegian, Finnish, Swedish and Danish
- there are a number of languages which have a special status in one or more than one Nordic states, i.e. Meänkieli, Kven, Yiddish, Romani, German, the Nordic sign languages
- some 200 other languages than the ones mentioned are spoken in the Nordic countries due to widespread immigration
- when referring to 'all languages of the Nordic countries' the declaration intends to cover the totality of languages spoken, i.e. to include these close to two hundred other languages as well
- when referring to those who live permanently in one of the Nordic countries the declaration will use the expression 'Nordic resident'.

This elaborate introduction with a number of definitions was necessary in order to formulate both the preconditions and the goals of a Nordic language policy. The conditions were formulated as follows:

"The basis for Nordic language policy is that the languages of the Nordic countries essential to society are and will remain strong and vital, and that those that are essential to society will remain so, and that Nordic cooperation will continue to be carried out in the Scandinavian languages, i.e. Danish Norwegian and Swedish."

Obviously, the danger not referred to is the danger of losing whole domains to English (Höglin 2002). Thus the fear is that a Nordic language hitherto complete and thus used in all domains would be demoted to being non-complete, to use the terminology of the preamble. We note in passing that the idea behind the last passage of this formulation is that of every member state speaking its own language and understanding those of the other member states except that Finland and Iceland have to shift into Swedish and Danish respectively. In the course of preparing the text we discussed the use of interpreters but the budget of Nordic cooperation is shrinking from year to year and introducing interpreters would go against this. Nevertheless, it is important to bear this principle in mind during the following discussion. It would have been equally logical to call for the help of professional interpreters during all meetings concerned with Nordic cooperation.
The next section of the declaration is concerned with rights. As the idea of 'language rights' gets more and more accepted we have in the West established this particular agenda ultimately referring to the bill of human rights. In the battle for rights, 'language rights' is just one contender, just one way to fight the battle. As far as I understand, there is a certain

tension between on the one hand legislation which focuses on rights and on the other legal traditions which are less based on the individual and more on passing judgement according to state introduced parliamentary accepted policy. In this battle of traditions, declarations squarely side with the human rights people and this declaration is no exception. But what rights are really rights and what do we mean by rights, anyway? Right may mean 'goal to strive for' and we might thus take rights in a weakened sense so that infringement of certain 'rights' by the state will go unpunished. In contrast, if right is taken literally, an individual whose rights were violated would be able to file a lawsuit against the state and win it.

This discussion became painfully concrete when we the experts in the Nordic Language Council discussed the rights of any resident to use his or her mother tongue. If the right to speak it is to be worth anything, this should include support for it. In the final version of the declaration this is reflected in the statement that

"Nordic language policy is based on all Nordic residents having the right to
[…]
preserve and develop their mother tongue and their national minority language"

but the original draft had a stronger wording calling for state support for the development of all mother tongues (first languages). Immediately when the draft declaration was presented to the Nordic committee of education, the Danish representatives took exception to the formulation of this passage. This is not surprising and for a number of reasons. When the present Danish government took office in 2001, one of the first issues they used to signal their having another stance than the previous government was the end of state subsidies for mother tongue education for minority children. The practice of mother tongue education was not abandoned or prohibited, but it was left to the local communities to finance it. If it were now to be declared a right for all Nordic citizens to have support for mother tongue education, it would be possible for any individual, speaking any language on the planet, to file a lawsuit against the Danish government if it did not support his or her mother tongue by securing him or her mother-tongue education.

To cut a very long story very short: The solution was unexpected and strange: The ministers agreed to accept a (weakened) version of the passage as long as they could preface the whole declaration with a statement to the effect that the declaration was not legally binding. Since the ministers state in the same preface that they will work towards fulfilling the goals set up in the declaration, this only has the function of exempting the Danish or any other subscribing state from any lawsuit whatsoever based on the declaration text, in particular its statement of rights. The Nordic countries thus seem to be in the peculiar situation of having a declaration of intention as to language rights but that at the same time it has been indicated that the declaration cannot be taken as legally binding, in other words it is not a declaration of rights but a declaration of intentions.

The Declaration mainly concerns other matters, however, in particular how we can make the Nordic linguistic utopia of complete mutual comprehension happen. How can we reverse the trend so that all Nordic citizens may speak the language essential to the society they are a member of and be certain to be understood by any fellow Nordic citizen? How can we make it happen that he or she can speak any one of the three Scandinavian languages him- or herself and understand the two other Scandinavian languages when spoken by another Nordic citizen?

In the section on the Delsing report above, I stated that there seem to be good reasons for declaring the whole enterprise of making Nordic citizens understand each other in their own language a mission impossible since the young participants in the study are much better at understanding English than neighbouring languages. But note that for obvious reasons the Delsing report only concerns the reception and understanding of English, not the speaking competence. What the Delsing results show is thus that English is a handy and not totally impossible lingua franca in terms of comprehension. But the language faculty has this peculiar feature of being asymmetric: There is a great difference between what we are able to say and what we are able to understand: We may understand English very well but that does not mean that we are able to express all that we can easily say in our first language, in English. On the contrary, there is every indication that we in the Nordic countries are not able to express ourselves that well in English. English has not (yet) become 'our second mother tongue' as the present Danish minister of education (and Nordic affairs) Bertel Haarder once, to my mind foolishly, expressed himself.[3]

Hence the current concern with higher education using English: It might very well be the case that both teachers and students fail to communicate all that they wanted to say or as well as they wanted to say it in English, and so the quality of the educational exchange will suffer.

The possibly utopian idea behind the declaration of Nordic Language Policy is thus 'speak your own language and understand that of the others'. But as hinted at this cannot be the whole truth. Here we again come back to the peculiar nature of the Nordic cultural region. The Nordic cultural region includes Finland. Finland used to be bilingual but it is becoming more and more Finnish and thus it cannot be expected that any given citizen of Finland will understand Swedish, let alone speak it. And note that the utopian idea of the Nordic language community rests on the fact that the central Scandinavian languages, Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, are closely related and consequently easier to learn for the neighbouring speakers than any other language, including English. The idea was simple: It just takes an educational effort to present the Norwegian and Swedish language as it is spoken (and written, but that is much easier as both the Maurud and the Delsing report shows) to Danish pupils (and vice versa to Swedish and Norwegian ones) all through primary school, a follow up effort on the part of the high school teachers and ample opportunities to meet with real neighbours during school visits. This effort is not made on a grand scale now and the consequence is that the populations are growing apart.

No educational effort, however, will make Finnish easier to Danes or Norwegians, than e.g. German or French. If anything, the structure of the language is vastly more different than the other Germanic or even the Romance languages. Thus Finland is only part of this effort if Finns will accept learning to speak Swedish *as well as* learning to understand Danish and Norwegian. It all boils down to this: Finland has a much higher price to pay for the Nordic benefits, even if they are real – or perceived as real by the Finns. The same goes for Iceland although the distance between Icelandic and Norwegian is far less than the linguistic distance – if this notion has any meaning at all – between Finnish and Norwegian.

The conclusion is bleak. We have arrived at a situation where the utopia outlined by the declaration was taken exception to for political reasons, with the consequence that the whole endeavour has become more or less void. The reason for attempting a grander scheme was precisely that the present effort measured against the actual language use among the younger

generations in the Nordic states seemed endless or counterproductive. But the utopian ideal described by the declaration costs money, money for the education of teachers and for the development of new materials suited for the pedagogy of 'talking your own language and understanding that of the others'', i.e. a language pedagogy for comprehension competence in neighbouring languages. And since the political impropriety of the rights issue made the ministers shrink from just signing the declaration, they have no incentive to put political force behind it, changing all the necessary regulations in teachers' education and so on and so forth to meet the challenge – although it could have been an ideal for Europe….

A Language policy for Europe?

The result of the analysis above is that the Nordic countries, willy-nilly, have to make a choice: Either they base the cooperation on the idea of being able to speak a Scandinavian language (thus making it harder for Finns, Sami, Greenlanders and Icelanders to fathom why *their* mother tongue cannot be used) or they choose to use English as the lingua franca and this will make it very strange indeed to limit the cooperation to the Nordic states and even the Baltic States. I do not mention here the immense loss of cultural capital which will result if this second option is taken, but I find it very hard to imagine that the first option is viable without the consent of the Finns to accept a Nordic community with a core and a periphery, the core being the three Scandinavian States.[4]

If, however, the asymmetry between production and comprehension is coupled with the idea of linguistic distance being governed by genetic relationships we might draw a map of Europe which could to a certain extent be based on a regional alternative to the international lingua franca of English.

If we do not do anything, there will only be two levels in Europe: A local language and English. The vision behind the Nordic declaration was that it should be possible to have a linguistic community encompassing all the speakers of Nordic languages thus creating a middle level between the local language and English. In the terms of Harder (this volume), in passing the declaration the Council was acting as a social constructor; and although social constructions are not fully determined by actual circumstances, they need to stand on solid ground in order to be viable. Obviously, this will not appear out of nowhere, it has to be created by forceful support of initiatives aiming at teaching pupils and grown ups the understanding of the neighbouring languages. In propagating this, advantage should be taken of the idea that it is easy to learn another Nordic language, much easier than learning a language which, though related, is not as closely related. There is, as Jørn Lund has put it, a discount here. You get three for the price of one.

If we generalize this model, we may distinguish at least five regions in Europe:

- The German-Dutch area encompassing the states of Germany and Austria and the Netherlands plus Flanders in Belgium and Liechtenstein and parts of Switzerland
- The British area encompassing the United Kingdom and Ireland
- The Slavic area with Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Russia, Slovenia, Serbia and Croatia, plus Macedonia, Bosnia and Montenegro

- The Romance area encompassing at least: France, Italy, Portugal, Spain (including Catalunya but excluding the Basque speaking province), Romania, plus Wallonia (Belgium) and parts of Switzerland
- The Fenno-Ugric area with Finland, Hungary and Estonia

As anyone can see at a glance the cultural linguistic regions do not all of them coincide with geographic regions which may or may not be a precondition for a language policy based on the asymmetry between production and comprehension to work. But far more daunting is the perspective of getting old and new enemies like the states in the Slavic language family to cooperate on a grand scale. Although comfort may be had from dreaming about the age when pan-slavism was a real cultural driving force, I have no illusions as to this vision. It will remain a vision of extraordinary clarity - and total unreality. But then again: So may the Nordic one.

Notes

1. Helge Sandøy and Tore Kristiansen have directed an inter-Nordic effort to disclose the preconditions and actual effects of English on the lexicon in all Nordic countries, cf. Sandøy and Kristiansen fc.

2. On the Norwegian language of *nynorsk*, see Vikør 2002

3. When I gave a talk for the Nordic lecturers in the Romance speaking countries in Genova I quoted this and the professor of Scandinavian at the University of Florence, Italy, told me that once his premier, Silvio Berlusconi, had used the same expression about English becoming the Italians' second mother tongue.

4. This point has been driven home to me in discussions with Jørn Lund. This should not lead any one to believe that he has any responsibility for my formulation of it here – or indeed any other sections in this paper but I am grateful for our discussions.

References

The Nordic Declaration of Language Policy originally was written in Swedish but it has been translated into all Nordic languages as well as English. It is available at the following address: http://www.norden.org/pub/kultur/kultur/sk/ANP2007746.pdf

Davidsen-Nielsen, Niels, Hansen, Erik og Jarvad Pia (red.) 1999: *Engelsk eller ikke engelsk? That is the question*. Dansk Sprognævns skrifter 28, Gyldendal: København

Delsing, Lars Olof and Lundin Åkesson, Katarina: *Håller språket ihop Norden?En forskningsrapport om ungdomars förståelse av danska, svenska og norska*. Tema Nord 2005:573, available at the following address: http://www.norden.org/pub/kultur/kultur/sk/TN2005573.pdf

Höglin, Renée 2002: *Engelska språket som hot och tillgång i Norden*. TemaNord Språksamarbete:561, Nordiska Ministerrådet.

Joseph, John E. 2006: *Language and Politics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Maurud, Øivind 1976: *Nabospråksforståelse I Skandinavia. En undersøkelse om gjensidigforståelse av tale- og skriftspråk I Danmark, Norge og Sverige.* Nordisk utredningsserie 13, Nordiska Rådet: Stockholm.

Milani, Tommaso 2007: *Debating Swedish. Language politics and Ideology in Contemporary Sweden.* Dissertations in Bilingualism 14. Stockholm: Stockholm University: Centre for Research on Bilingualism: chapter II: 1-30.

Mål i mun. 2002: *Mål i mun. Förslag till handlingsprogram för svenska språket.* Statens Offentliga Utredningar (SOU), 2002:27: Fritze: Stockholm
Sandøy, Helge and Kristiansen, Tore fthc.: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language: special issue on the Nordic project on imported words*, The Hague: Mouton

Sandøy, Helge and Kristiansen, Tore (eds.): fthc: Special issue of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* focussed on the Nordic Study on imported words

Sørensen, Knud 1997: *A Dictionary of Anglicisms in Danish*. Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 18, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Munksgaard: Copenhagen.

Vikør, Lars S. 2002: The nynorsk language of Norway, http://www.aasentunet.no/default.asp?menu=94&id=455